Subject: Re: CPRA request (LAPC.2020.07.28.a)
From: [redacted]
Date: 8/7/20, 8:03 AM
To: "Mark Smith" <n3145@lapd.online>

Thanks for responding.

You ask me to "clarify" my request in various ways:

1. Calendars - Here you're actually asking me to narrow my request rather than clarify it. It's clear as is, is it not, in the only sense that matters under the CPRA, which is that I'm asking for reasonably identifiable records. If there's some reason to narrow it please let me know what it is.

2. LAPD.COM - thanks for asking! Indeed, there was a typo. Rather than lapd.com I meant to request emails at "lapd.com OR lappl.org". Thanks again for asking.

3. Representing - If I knew who counted as a representative of LAPPL I wouldn't have phrased the request that way. The law requires me to request reasonably identifiable records. Courts have universally found that that requirement allows citizens, who often have no idea whatsoever what local agencies are up to and therefore can't be expected to be able to provide exact technically correct descriptions of records, to instead describe them by content. Which is what I've done. The appropriate question here is not who I consider to be a representative but who you or your colleagues, who understand the workings of your agency, consider to be a representative.

Thanks again!

[redacted]

On Thu, Aug 6, 2020, at 9:25 PM, Mark Smith wrote:

> Dear [redacted]
>
> The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) is in receipt of requests that you sent via email to the Los Angeles Police Commission (Commission) for records pursuant to the California Public Records Act (Cal. Govt. Code §§6250, *et seq.*, hereafter "CPRA" or the "Act"). Specifically, your requests – which were sent after the close of business on July 28, 2020 – seek daily calendar entries of the Inspector General for 2019 and 2020, as well as email communications to and from OIG staff members, for the same time period.